



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/041,034

12/28/2001

Peter Gassner

021756-017130US

2584

51206

7590

08/06/2008

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

VU, TUAN A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2193

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/06/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/041,034	Applicant(s) GASSNER ET AL.	
	Examiner Tuan A. Vu	Art Unit 2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-12, 15-17, 19-23, 26-31, 38-48, 60-64, 71-74 and 78-80 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-12, 15-17, 19-23, 26-31, 38-48, 60-64, 71-74 and 78-80 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the Applicant's response filed 5/6/08.

As indicated in Applicant's response, claims 4-12, 15-17, 15-17, 21-23, 26-31, 38, 40-41, 43-48, 60-64, 71-72 have been amended, claims 24-25 canceled, and 9claims 78-80 added. Claims 4-12, 15-17, 19-23, 26-31, 38-48, 60-64, 71-74, and 78-80 are pending in the office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 4-6, 78-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The limitation recited as 'personalization server' having a personalization engine to deliver user profile interface and to "allow user to modify personalization data, the personalization data characterizing at least one property ... user interface element ... presented on the client device", construed in the context of the claim which already includes *Internet application server* and *Web server* cannot be viewed as having proper enabling support from the Specifications. The Disclosure teaches a *personalization engine* (Specs, pg. 7, 13) and a personalization process performed by a user using said engine (Specs pg. 26) in a local context

Art Unit: 2193

wherein the user is able to modify data; but nowhere is conveyed this engine being a server-installed entity. Regarding the description of Figure 3, Internet application server is disclosed as enabling the user to modify property of a GUI element, and web server as one to deliver the application interface to the client device. With Server 309 and 305 (see Figure 3) being respectively Internet application server, and Web server, the ‘personalization server’ (to deliver user profile interface ... and to allow modify a property) amounts to a entity different to the personalization engine which is not a server, thus clearly non-enabled, i.e. the inventor has no possession of this “server” feature at the time the invention was made. The claim is rejected for not providing sufficient support for ‘personalization server’ and this limitation would be treated as a functional feature/capability of the system whereby user can modify personalization data or profile via an interface or a page property.

Claims 4-6, 78-79 are rejected for lack of enabling support or lack of compliant description, and the term ‘personalization server’ would be treated as set forth above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4-12, 78-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beauchamp, USPN: 6,621,505 (hereinafter Beauchamp).

As per claim 4, Beauchamp discloses a system for generating application user interfaces enabling customization of the user interfaces for each of a plurality of users, the system comprising:

an Internet application server operable to execute at least one selected Internet application of a plurality of Internet applications, the Internet application server including a user interface generator operable to generate at least one application user interface for the selected Internet application (e.g. Fig. 13; *request, define the screen, produce the screen* - col. 24 line 17-36 – Note: parsing XML from request and using both back end server and submitting of response processed by Universal client reads on server operable to generate application user interface; i.e. *produce a screen*), customized for each user using metadata for the at least one application user interface, and the personalization data (e.g. step 462 - Fig. 14B) for each user requesting the at least one application user interface using the client device of each user (col. 23, line 66 to col. 24, line 56);

a data repository including a data record (e.g. to represent a customer – col. 21 lines 50-54; Fig. 10) for storing the personalization data for each of the plurality of users, the data record being accessible using the metadata (using metadata, RDBMS – col. 18 lines 9-13; reference process metadata - Fig. 12, 13); and

a web server operable to deliver the customized application user interface to the client device of each of the plurality of users (e.g. Fig 13 – Note: server to transmit response enabling Universal Client to render screen – see Fig. 3-5 - reads on delivering application user interface being customized by user request).

Beauchamp discloses a personalization server (Note: server treated as software capability – see USC 112, Rejection) including a personalization engine (Fig. 13, 15) and operable to deliver a user interface to a client device for each of a plurality of users, the personalization server being further operable to allow each user to modify personalization data for that user through the user interface (e.g. user specified processes, screen name – Fig. 3; Fig. 4-5; step 462 - Fig. 14B), modifying data characterizing a property on the user interface element presented to the user (e.g. Fig. 4-5; col. 10 line 20 to col. 11 line 30; Previous, Next, User Input, Assign, Pause, Cancel – Fig 14B) on the client device of each user.

But Beauchamp does not explicitly disclose *user profile interface* being delivered, enabling user to modify personalization data for that user *through the user profile interface*. But based on the storage of personalized data (col. 21 lines 50-54; Customer Specific 604, Fig. 16; *security profiles* – col. 18 lines 30-37) in the repository accessible by metadata and request, and delivering of response by a server to accommodate user's request (Fig. 8, 13) as well as modifying of the delivered screen by modifying a property representing a GUI element as set forth above, it would have been obvious for one skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the user screen and repository system in Beauchamp, so that user interface being delivered would be for implementing profile-based application for the particular user, such the property being personalized using said user profile interface could be modified and otherwise customized via the GUI elements – i.e. button clicking as set forth above (Fig. 14B), because this type of profile based screen customization would fall under the applicability contemplated in the process by Beauchamp, shown in terms of business transactions or individual data type spreadsheeting instances pertinent to one given user (see Vendor, Weekly price, Fig. 2; user calendar,

Journee Client – Fig. 5; specified purposes ... business objects – col. 6 lines 49-65; col. 9 lines 31-35) in conjunction with profile data for that user.

As per claims 5-6, Beauchamp discloses wherein the application user interface customized for each of the plurality of users includes customization of an interaction model (Fig. 14A, B) ; wherein the interaction model determines the timing of communication between the client device and the web server (e.g. *pauses* - col. 17 lines 51-67; col. 18, lines 38-67; Fig. 7).

As per claim 7, Beauchamp discloses a system for developing an Internet application including an application user interface with a customizable interaction model, the system comprising:

an application development operable to allow a developer to specify at least one user interface element (user specified, Pause, Cancel, Next – Fig. 3; user selects the ... progression screen – col. 10 lines 46-65) to be included in the application user interface, the at least one user interface element being associated with an interaction model, customizable by each of a plurality of users on a client device accessing the application user interface to modify functionality of the at least one user interface element (e.g. Fig. 3-5 – Note: request being parsed and returned with response enabling Universal client to render customizable screens – see Fig. 12, 13, 14A,B – including underlying meta information for user's specified business process reads on interaction model being a specific business objective – see *specified purposes ... business objects* – col. 6 lines 49-65; col. 9 lines 31-35);

an application designer configured to produce metadata (XML generator 236 Fig. 8) associated with the interaction model;

a personalization server system including a personalization engine and operable to deliver a user interface to the client device of each of the plurality of users, the personalization system being further operable to allow each user to modify personalization data for that user through the user interface (user specified processes, screen name – Fig. 3; Fig. 4-5; step 462 - Fig. 14B; col. 10 line 20 to col. 11 line 30), the personalization data characterizing the interaction model (Note: request being parsed and returned with response enabling Universal client to render customizable screens – see Fig. 12, 13, 14A,B – including underlying meta information for user's specified business process reads on interaction model) for each user for the at least one user interface element (Fig. 4-5; col. 10 line 20 to col. 11 line 30; Previous, Next, User Input, Assign, Pause, Cancel – Fig 14B) included in the application user interface presented on the client device of each user; and

a data repository including a data record configured to store the personalization data for each of the plurality of users, the data record being accessible using the metadata (refer to claim 4);

wherein the application user interface contains different functionality of the at least one user interface element (col. 9 lines 8-46; Fig. 3-5)for different users depending upon the personalization data for those users.

But Beauchamp does not explicitly disclose *user profile interface* being delivered, enabling user to modify personalization data for that user *through the user profile interface*. This limitation has been addressed as obvious in the rationale set forth in claim 4.

As per claim 8, Beauchamp discloses wherein the application development server is further configured to specify display of an interaction model control command (e.g. *how to*

render -- col. 4 lines 49-60 Note: XML sent from server supporting rendering reads on control command - col. 24 line 17-36; *from the process server ... that are specified by the process data* - col 7 lines 29-40; Fig. 3-5- Note: screens specifically called for in processing of request by server, being sent therefrom and thus specified for display and rendering on the Universal client **reads on** specifying what to display as screen types by the server – see col 13 line 23 to col. 16, line 14; *may manage ... descendant attributes* – col. 18 lines 49-57; control process functionality – col 18 lines 24-29) in the application user interface, the interaction model control command being configured for each user to customize the interaction model.

As per claim 9, Beauchamp discloses wherein the interaction model customizable by each user allows selection from a keyboard and point-click based interaction model (Fig 3 – Note: button as *Next, Pause, Previous* reads on keyboard or point click), and from a deferred and immediate communication based interaction model between the client device (*pauses* - col. 17 lines 51-67; *Next navigation ... advances the state appropriately forward* - col 20 lines 53-61) and the Internet application for each user interface element.

As per claim 10, Beauchamp discloses wherein the interaction model is configurable according to the identity of each user (step 400, 406 – Fig 14A) or the identity of the client device of each user.

As per claims 11-12, Beauchamp discloses wherein a state of the interaction model is further configurable to persist between uses (e.g. col 29 lines 48-57; col 18; *manage multiple versions* - lines 13-21, lines 58-67; col 27 lines 41-60) of the application user interface; wherein the data record is further modifiable using a configuration system (massage - col 21 lines 48-67).

As per claim 78, Beauchamp discloses wherein the at least one property of the at least one user interface element is associated with mode of data input and output (Assign, next – Fig. 3), presentation of requested information (next, previous – Fig. 3-4).

As per claim 79, Beauchamp discloses wherein the at least one property of the at least one user interface element includes a tab order property (Screen Name, Goal Name – Fig 3), a find command (Help, Next – Fig. 3), and an immediate access keystroke sequence (Next, Cancel – Fig. 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 15-17, 19-23, 26-27, 29-31, 38-48, 60-64, 71-74, 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Beauchamp et al., USPN: 6,621,505 (hereinafter Beauchamp).

As per claim 15, Beauchamp discloses a system for generating a user interface, the system comprising:

an Internet application server operable to support an Internet application (HTTPS, Web server, HTTP – Fig. 7);

an application user interface generator operable to generate the user interface for the Internet application for display on a client device (step 432, 436 - Fig. 14B) of each of a plurality

of users, the user interface being generated using personalization data (e.g. user specified Processes – Fig 3; security profiles – col. 18 lines 30-37; for the user – col. 24 lines 18-30) for each of the plurality of users, the personalization data being modifiable by each of the plurality of users and the personalization data characterizing at least one property of the user interface (e.g. Fig. 4-5; col. 10 line 20 to col. 11 line 30; Previous, Next, User Input, Assign, Pause, Cancel – Fig 14B), the at least one property (user specified Processes – Fig 3) including an interaction model between the client device and the Internet application server;

metadata associated with the at least one property of the user interface (col. 6 lines 56-65; col. 4 lines 49-60); and

a data repository including a data record for storing the personalization data for each of the plurality of users (*security profiles* – col. 18 lines 30-37; *to represent a customer* – col. 21 lines 50) on the client device,

wherein each of the plurality of users is able to modify the personalization data such that the application user interface functions differently (Fig. 14B – Note: use of Universal Client – Fig 2 - as instance of a common framework with default features extensible by user actions reads no interface functioning different per user log-on – Fig. 14A) for different users.

As per claims 16-17, Beauchamp discloses wherein the application user interface is configured for display on the client device using standard web browser protocols (HTTPS, Web server, HTTP – Fig. 7); using features of a web browser, the features not requiring (Previous, Next, User Input, Assign, Pause, Cancel – Fig 14B) a browser add-on, plug-in, or extension.

As per claims 19-20, Beauchamp discloses including a configuration system configured to modify the data record (refer to claim 12); wherein the configuration system is included in the

Internet application (Fig. 12 – Note: data communicated as message including personalization data and persisted as reusable metadata and modifiable in database reads no configuration system include in the paradigm encompassing this web application, the internet and XML).

As per claim 21, Beauchamp discloses an Internet application system having processor readable storage devices and processor readable code embedded therein for executing instructions on a computer system, comprising:

a user interface generator configured to generate an application user interface, the application user interface being compatible with a standard web browser (HTTP, XML – Fig. 9 – Note: delivery of XML to Universal client reads on web browser) and being generated in response to a request from a client device of each of a plurality of users, the user interface generator utilizing personalization data to generate the application user interface (col. 24 line 17-36; Fig. 14B; Fig. 8);

a web application server (Process server – Fig 13; col. 24 line 17-36 – Note: parsing XML from request and using both back end server and submitting of response processed by Universal client reads on server operable to generate application user interface; i.e. *produce a screen*) configured to deliver the application user interface to the client device of each user; and

an Internet application accessible to the each user through the generated application user interface (HTTPS, HTTP – Fig. 7; HTTPS, XML - Fig. 13),

wherein each user is able to specify modify the personalization data, the personalization data characterizing at least one property of the user interface, the at least one property(e.g. Fig. 4-5; col. 10 line 20 to col. 11 line 30; Previous, Next, User Input, Assign, Pause, Cancel – Fig 14B) including an interaction model (refer to claim 15) between the client device and the Internet

application, such that the application user interface functions differently for different users (refer to claim 15).

As per claims 22-23, Beauchamp discloses wherein the user interface generator is further configured to use metadata to generate the application user interface (e.g. col 4 lines 45-62). wherein the interaction model is specific (e.g. Fig. 3-5 – Note: request being parsed and returned with response enabling Universal client to render customizable screens – see Fig. 12, 13, 14A,B – including underlying meta information for user’s specified business process reads on interaction model being a specific business objective – see *specified purposes ... business objects* – col. 6 lines 49-65; col. 9 lines 31-35) to a user interface element (Fig. 3-5) included in the application user interface.

As per claims 26-27, refer to claims 10 and 9, respectively.

As per claim 29, Beauchamp discloses a computer program product embedded in a computer readable medium for generating a customizable application user interface, comprising program code for:

generating an application user interface including at least one user interface element customizable by each of a plurality of users, the application user interface configured for delivery to a client device (Fig 13 – Note: HTTP interface to transmit response enabling Universal Client to render screen – see Fig. 3-5 - reads on application interface delivering application user interface being customized by user request – see col. 5 lines 22-36) of each user and to operate as an interface between each user and an Internet application including the application user interface (Universal Client - Fig. 7-8, 13);

allowing the each user to modify personalization data for the each user (user specified processes – Fig 3), the personalization data characterizing at least one property of the at least one user interface element (e.g. Fig. 4-5; col. 10 line 20 to col. 11 line 30; Previous, Next, User Input, Assign, Pause, Cancel – Fig 14B) for use with the application user interface and any other application interface using the at least one user interface element (Fig. 2);

storing in a data record the personalization data in a location physically remote (e.g. databases Fig. 6; database 206 , Fig. 13; to represent a customer – col. 21 lines 50-54; Fig. 10) from the client device of each user; and storing metadata (process database – col. 6 lines 52-65) configurable for use by the user interface generator to access the data record,

wherein each user is able to modify the personalization data such that the application user interface functions differently for different users (refer to claim 15).

As per claim 30, refer to claim 9 (deferred and immediate).

As per claim 31, refer to claim 10.

As per claim 38, Beauchamp discloses a method of developing an application user interface associated with an Internet application, the method comprising the steps of:

selecting an interaction model (e.g. *various type of screens ... designated to implement a process* – col. 13 lines 23-27; from a client – col. 5 lines 21-30 – Note: screens rendered according to specification of user request reads on selecting a model) characterized by a data record, the data record (Process database 206 – Fig. 7; process database - col 5 lines 25-30) being stored in a data repository and being user modifiable allowing each of a plurality of users to modify functionality of at least one user interface element in the application user interface (e.g. Fig. 4-5; col. 10 line 20 to col. 11 line 30; Previous, Next, User Input, Assign, Pause,

Cancel – Fig 14B), the data repository being physically remote from a client device of each user used to display the application user interface (refer to claim 29);

generating the application user interface for each user using the selected interaction model and the data record (e.g. Fig. 13; *request, define the screen, produce the screen* - col. 24 line 17-36 – Note: parsing XML from request and using both back end server – or process database - and submitting of response processed by Universal client reads on server operable to generate application user interface; i.e. *produce a screen*);

generating metadata characterizing associated with the interaction model (XML 308 - Fig. 13), the metadata including a reference to the data record; and

storing the metadata in association with the Internet application (col. 23 lines 40-48), the Internet application being configured for access using the application user interface, wherein each user is able to specify modify the data record such that the application user interface functions differently for different users (refer to claim 15).

As per claim 39, Beauchamp discloses interaction model control command (refer to claim 8).

As per claim 40, refer to claim 6.

As per claim 41, Beauchamp discloses a method of generating an application user interface, the method comprising the steps of:

accessing a page definition (XML→ Rules engine 234 – Fig 8; col 24 lines 17-22), the page definition including metadata associated with at least one customizable property of at least one interaction model user interface element of the application user interface (Fig 3-4; col. 4 lines 49-62);

accessing a data record using the metadata (col. 24 lines 23-27), the data record being stored in a data repository (process database 206, Fig. 8) and characterizing the customizable property and being modifiable by each of a plurality of users, to modify the customizable property (user specified processes, screen name – Fig. 3; step 462 - Fig. 14B; Fig. 4-5; col. 10 line 20 to col. 11 line 30; *Previous, Next, User Input, Assign, Pause, Cancel* – Fig 14B), the data repository being physically remote from a client device (refer to claim 29) of each user used to display the application user interface;

determining a value (e.g. Fig. 13; rule engine 234, Fig 8; col. 16 lines 37-41; step 420, 426, Fig 14A; step 432, Fig. 14B - Note: using rules engine while processing XML tags in user's request reads on determining a value characterizing customizable property - col. 4 lines 49-62; screens types – col. 13 lines 22-27) characterizing the at least one customizable property using the data record;

generating markup-language responsive to the determined value; and including the generated markup-language in the application user interface, the application user interface being an interface to an Internet application (XML 380- Fig .13; Fig. 14A, B; transmits the XML response – col. 24 lines 23-30),

wherein each user is able to modify the data record characterizing the at least one customizable property (e.g. Fig. 4-5; col. 10 line 20 to col. 11 line 30; *Previous, Next, User Input, Assign, Pause, Cancel* – Fig 14B) such that the application user interface including the user interface elements functions differently for different users (refer to claim 29).

As per claim 42, refer to claim 12 for modifying the data record using a personalization system.

As per claim 43, refer to claim 9 for deferred mode of communication between the client device and the Internet application

As per claim 44, refer to claim 10.

As per claim 45, Beauchamp discloses method of personalizing an interaction model to be used with multiple application user interfaces, the method comprising the steps of:

selecting the interaction model associated with a data record and specifying interaction functionality to be associated with each application user interface, the data record characterizing the interaction model and being customizable by each of a plurality of users on a client device, for characterizing the user customizable interaction model, the interaction model including a plurality of interaction modes;

generating at least one application user interface using the interaction model and the data record; generating metadata characterizing the interaction model, the metadata including a reference to the data record; and

storing the metadata in association with an application, the application being configured for access using the application user interface, wherein each user is able to modify the data record characterizing the interaction model such that the application user interface functions differently for different users;

all of which limitations being similarly recited in claim 38 and addressed correspondingly therein.

As per claim 46, Beauchamp discloses wherein a mode (pause – Fig. 3-4) of the interaction model is responsive to a command included in the application user interface.

As per claim 47, Beauchamp discloses an immediate mode (Cancel, Next, Previous – Fig. 3).

As per claim 48, Beauchamp discloses wherein a customizable state of the interaction model is configurable to persist (col 29 lines 48-57; col 18; *manage multiple versions* - lines 13-21, lines 58-67; col 27 lines 41-60) between uses of the HTML based application user interface.

As per claim 60, Beauchamp discloses a computer implemented method of executing an Internet application, comprising the steps of:

receiving a request from a client device of each of a plurality of users (Fig. 13; *request, define the screen, produce the screen* - col. 24 line 17-36 – Note: parsing XML from request and using both back end metadata in request reads on receiving request to obtain application user interface; i.e. *produce a screen*) for an application user interface, the application user interface including at least one user interface element (Fig. 3-4, Fig. 14A,B);

accessing a page definition, the page definition including metadata (refer to claim 41) associated with the application user interface;

retrieving, using the metadata, a value characterizing an interaction model associated with the user interface, the value being stored in a data repository physically remote from the client device of each user, the value further being specified by each user (Fig. 13; rule engine 234, Fig 8; col. 16 lines 37-41; step 420, 426, Fig 14A; step 432, Fig. 14B - Note: using rules engine while processing XML tags in user's request reads on retrieving based on a value characterizing screen of interaction model associated with user interface - col. 4 lines 49-62; screens types – col. 13 lines 22-27) in order to modify interaction functionality of the application user interface (Fig. 3-4; col. 10 line 20 to col. 11 line 30);

generating HTML responsive to the retrieved value; including the generated HTML in the application user interface; and delivering the application user interface to the client device of each user, the application user interface being an interface between each user and the Internet application (refer to claim 41);

wherein each user is able to modify the value in the data repository characterizing the interaction model (Note: XML based specifications in conjunction with process database and subsequent retrieval by server – col. 5 lines 22-30; Fig. 14A,B - of DB-retrieved screens for customization by the requesting user – Fig. 8, 13 – reads on ‘able to modify value in the repository’ by user based on item retrieved from interaction model represented by request and parsed XML) such that the application user interface functions differently for different users (refer to claim 29)

As per claim 61, refer to claim 9.

As per claim 62, Beauchamp discloses wherein the interaction model is specific to a user interface element (user specified 132, Pause 130; User specified 126, Next 124 – Fig. 3).

As per claim 63, Beauchamp discloses including displaying the application user interface at the client device (browser – col. 15 lines 51-65) using standard web browser protocols.

As per claim 64, refer to claim 10.

As per claim 71, Beauchamp discloses a computer implemented method of generating an application user interface configured for delivery from a server to a client device, comprising the steps of:

receiving, at the server, a request for the application user interface from a client device of each of a plurality of users (refer to claim 60);

identifying each user requesting the application user interface, the application user interface being associated with an interaction model (Note: receiving a request for a screen based on parsing a XML reads on identifying nature of application user interface in the request); accessing a page definition, the page definition including metadata and associated with the application user interface (refer to claim 41);

retrieving, using the metadata and the identity of each user (logon Fig. 14A), a value for characterizing the interaction model, the value being selected by each user in order to modify interaction functionality of the application user interface, the value being stored in a data repository (refer to claim 60);

generating HTML incorporating the interaction model using the value; including the generated HTML in the application user interface; and delivering the application user interface from the server to the client device of each user (refer to claim 60), wherein each user is able to modify the value in the data repository characterizing the interaction model (refer to claim 60) such that the application user interface functions differently for different users (refer to claim 29).

As per claims 72-73, Beauchamp discloses including communicating from the client device to the server responsive to the interaction model (steps 458, 470, 472 -Fig. 14B); wherein the communication occurs in a deferred mode (pause 468 Fig. 14B).

As per claim 74, Beauchamp discloses including displaying an interaction model control command (refer to claim 8) in the user interface.

As per claim 80, Beauchamp discloses wherein the customizable property includes a tab order property, a find command, and immediate access keystroke sequence (refer to claim 79).

8. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beauchamp et al., USPN: 6,621,505 as applied to claim 21, in view of Helgeson et al. USPN: 6,643,652 (hereinafter Helgeson).

As per claim 28, Beauchamp discloses a applicability to various protocols of communications (col. 19 lines 51-58) including interfacing with a modem or a direct modem link (col 30 line 31-39) but does not disclose wherein the client device is wireless system. Using a modem in light of the various protocols of communication at the time the invention was made suggests a modem based communication like that of a wireless device. In a method to extend the browser functionality similar to Beauchamp creating of browser metadata (Fig. 6), Helgeson discloses a client machine being a wireless device (cellular phone 411, Fig. 4). Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include in the client system of Beauchamp wireless devices as taught by Helgeson because rendering of client interface environment using metadata specified via a carrier like XML metadata would enable those wireless system to obtain support from server providers without a sustained link with such service; and thus by means of wireless protocol as taught above XML-formatted specification would provide resource-efficient support for dynamic for a as-needed basis application specification in order to render browser functionality as purported by Beauchamp, in view of the known concept that wireless devices entail restricted storage resources

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 5/6/08 have been fully considered but they are for the most part based on the current Amendment, i.e. not commensurate with the previous Office Action

addressing an older version of claimed subject matter; hence would be moot in light of the current Office Action being necessitated by the extensive changes to the independent claims. Besides, Applicant's argument raising the *standardized screens* by Beauchamp has been deemed not sufficient to overcome the rejection as set forth in the last Office Action (mailed 1/07/08) via Examiner's Response to Arguments Section. Further, Beauchamp is considered teaching what is recited as 'data repository including data record ... personalization data ... accessible using the metadata', and the current rejection has provided evidence showing how such language has been met. Thus, the claims as currently submitted stand rejected as set forth in the Office Action.

Interview Summary

10. The Examiner and the Representative, Mr. Lohr, in the course of a telephonic contact as per 7/31/08 had discussed on possibilities for changing the subject matter in the likes of independent claim 4's, as well as correcting some potential non-statutory deficiency (i.e. lack of hardware to support some software-based entities) in some claims in the hope to put the case in better condition for an eventual allowance. But no agreement was reached.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2193

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan A Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-3735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-4:30PM/Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lewis Bullock can be reached on (571)272-3759.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-3735 (for non-official correspondence - please consult Examiner before using) or 571-273-8300 (for official correspondence) or redirected to customer service at 571-272-3609.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Tuan A Vu/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2193

August 03, 2008